

- 1) Evelyn deSouza – 05/28/2024
- 2) Gregory Bistline – 05/30/2024
- 3) Hazal Joanes - 05/31/2024
- 4) James Benjamin - 05/31/2024
- 5) Mike Ferreira - 05/31/2024
- 6) Martin Nash – 05/31/2024
- 7) Fr. Jose Corral – Our Lady of the Pillar - 06/07/2024
 - Attached letter dated 02/05/2021

From: Evelyn deSouza
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2024 11:57 AM
To: Jill Ekas < Mike Noce < Matthew Chidester
Subject: Re: Second Housing Element Draft

Dear Matthew, Jill and Mike

I hope this letter finds you very well. I am writing to express my deep interest on the topic of housing in Half Moon Bay. I noticed that a second HCM Draft became available Friday with a feedback cycle of 7 days. Given the critical nature of this material may I please ask for your consideration of the following:

1. Regular Community Workshops and Information Sessions: Organize monthly workshops and information sessions. These sessions can provide residents with valuable information about the overall housing strategy including how affordable housing fits in, as most of us will not have the opportunity to digest this second draft in only a few days. For example, Poplar St residents have just learned about a potential project at the corner of Metzgar and Main and would love to learn more about which segment of the population this is designed to serve, and how this project may fit with the city's overall housing strategy before it reaches the Planning Commission.
2. Multilingual Outreach Materials: Consider publishing outreach materials in English and Spanish. This could help reach a broader audience and ensure that language barriers do not prevent residents from accessing vital information.
4. Further Utilization of Digital Platforms: Leverage social media, and email newsletters to regularly update residents on housing. Social media may be preferred by younger audiences and make this topic more accessible to them.

I will also discuss with Mayor Jiminez at an appropriate juncture but will be very grateful for any further steps you can take. As always, I am willing to assist in any capacity to achieve our shared goal of making affordable housing accessible to all.

Sincerely,

From: Gregory Bistline
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2024 12:11 PM
To: Housing Element
Subject: Housing

There is little doubt that housing for those of low income is needed (even if it was not mandated by the state).

That housing should comply closely to the local building codes especially in regard to aesthetics and habitability for the project and its neighbors.

The planning commission put its “stamp of approval” on the 555 Kelly project, ironically in the middle of the night. The plan as it exists will allow un healthy density (3 occupants in a studio apartment), make no provision for parking and exceeds the long enforced limit on height.

While the City may have its hands partially tied because of the big stick carried by the State, all reasonable measures should be taken to insure that the project conforms to local standards. The local codes were never designed to discourage low income housing and should not act as dejure or defacto barriers to needed and equitable housing. However the City should do all in its’ power to insure that any project accommodate the needs of ALL of its citizens.

Our Lady of Pillar will not assist its own parishioners in backing the proposed housing, the Council should follow suit.

From: hjoanes
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2024 3:26 PM
To: Housing Element
Cc: CDD Director
Subject: Comments Housing Element - Revised Cycle 6

Hello,

I received the notification of a 7-day comment period for the City's second draft of the Housing Element on Friday, May 24, 2024. That evening, I spoke with Mayor Jimenez about the timing of the release of this important document, specifically, I expressed my concern that the City had chosen to release this document over the Memorial Day federal holiday a three-day weekend when the public would be devoting time honoring and mourning the U.S. military personnel who died while serving in the Armed Forces but would not have the time to dedicate towards reviewing and commenting on this second draft. I requested the Mayor to ask the City Manager and the Community Development Director to extend the comment period beyond the May 31, 2024, deadline and allow for a full 30-day comment period.

While I understand that Government Code 65585 establishes minimum standards to achieve public comment, I believe that the City of Half Moon Bay should rise above the minimum standard, be exemplary, and engage in a diligent effort to inform the residents of all economic segments in the development of the housing element by taking this draft to the public instead of having the public randomly finding out about it. At the very least, staff should conduct neighborhood meetings, send mailers to residents, publish announcements on social media, and conduct a study session (as they did with the first draft) to explain why the changes to the first draft document required changes and to fully disclose the implications of the changes proposed in the second draft.

To meet the 7-day deadline, this email includes my comments on only the first three items shown on the matrix titled *Responses to August 30, 2023 "out" Letter*. Hopefully, the City will conduct community-wide study sessions and extend the comment period for this document.

Thank you,

Hazel

COMMENTS

A. Special Housing Needs: Page – Intro - 7

In highlighting that the senior household population on a fixed income is vulnerable to rising rents and increasing maintenance costs as a concern, the City must also recognize that this

senior population may also require housing choices that support their Activities of Daily Living (ADL).

The statement *“Senior households on a fixed income in the lowest income categories are also vulnerable to rising rents and/or increasing maintenance costs”* appears pointless if it does not acknowledge the realities and needs of the City’s aging population. This statement should be revised to encompass the different types of special housing needs that seniors might need i.e., independent retirement housing, assisted living, and memory care living or convalescent housing.

Additionally, shining the spotlight on farmworkers as a special housing needs group connotes that **all** farmworkers need housing. Framing only farmworkers as a special housing needs group promotes and enables the typecasting of the socioeconomic status of the farmworker group. While singling out farmworkers in the City’s Housing Element might be conducive to achieving approval from the State, it also promotes systemic and structural racism. The City should consider refining the statement *“Additionally, farmworkers are considered a special housing needs group, which the City is working to support through the use of City-owned land for farmworker housing opportunities.”* to 1) remove the statement entirely or, 2) state which subset of the City’s farmworker demographic it supports with its commitment to using City-owned land, and, or 3) expand the text to include other groups within the City’s population that need affordable housing such as the developmentally disabled, the physically challenged, and student population.

1. Special Needs Populations:

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) requested that the City provide an explanation or summary of the effectiveness of its past goals. The City’s response on Page – F3, lacks specificity of the City’s direct and active involvement that achieved goals stated in the past housing element cycle. For example, the City does not explain actions undertaken to support agricultural landowners to develop farmworker housing. There has been public testimony from certain agricultural landowners that the City rejected their request for support to construct farmworker housing on their agricultural land.

Additionally, the City does not provide details on its supportive actions for converting the Coastside Inn to a **homeless shelter**. According to Life Moves, Coast House (previously the Coastside Inn), provides **interim** housing for families, couples, and individuals experiencing homelessness. This type of housing is considered temporary until its clients can return to their homes. The City revision might explain the details of its support for the conversion of the hotel and provide specifics on how **interim** housing but not a homeless shelter lends toward the goals of the past cycle.

Other statements in this section include the City’s financial support for house repairs and rental assistance, however, the statement does not clearly explain how the rehabilitation grants and the use of money from the Affordable Housing Fund meet the **housing needs** of the special-

needs populations. Likewise, the City should explain whether the 91 households and the 12 unsheltered that received support through the City's Affordable Housing Fund were for households within the City's jurisdiction. Moreover, the City should clearly explain how its Affordable Housing Fund supports the **proposal** for the 40 units of farmworker housing and reveal how this satisfies the goals of the past cycle. Specifically, the City should make known how many farmworkers working on farms within the City boundaries would be guaranteed housing.

2. Local Data and Knowledge, and Other Relevant Factors: Page D-4

The City's justification to support the requirements of Chapter 15 (commencing with Section 8899.50) of Division 1 of Title 2...shall include an assessment of fair housing in the jurisdiction. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c)(10)(A). The City's discussion on page D-4 does not reference nor include local data, knowledge, or relevant factors that support the City's assertion of tensions between coastal preservation, visitor-serving, and farming preservation. These types of statements tend to incite and enable social and civil unrest.

The residents of Half Moon Bay have a long rich history of mutual respect between farmers, ranchers, farm workers, and visitors. They embrace diversity and inclusion of all nationalities and ethnic backgrounds. The City should explain how the Coastal and Williamson Acts influenced the City's land use plan rather than providing unsubstantiated statements claiming that there exist tensions between use-based zoning segregations that have caused a dramatic impact on social interactions within the City.

3. Local Data and Knowledge

The City's statement on page D-6 requires a depth of knowledge of the City's demographics. The City states that "Some racial and ethnic minority populations are disproportionately impacted by low household incomes, and overcrowding, and are more likely to be denied a home mortgage loan" but the city fails to describe who constitutes the racial and ethnic minority groups. The City should also address whether young adults residing in the City between the ages of 18 and 24 and adults beyond the age of 25 are also likely to be denied a home mortgage loan regardless of their ethnic background or minority status.

The City should investigate if this young adult population and adults should be considered seriously for city-supported housing programs. Appendix A – Housing Needs Assessment could also incorporate statistics and trends on whether the City's young adults regardless of ethnic background currently live, whether their living conditions are crowded, are susceptible to displacement, are in the low or extremely low-income bracket, etc.

The City's statement on page D-21 lacks specificity, relative to its seasonal and permanent farm workers. The city should distinguish the difference between a seasonal farm worker and a permanent farm worker and analyze which of the two groups requires housing urgently.

Additionally, the City should research, evaluate, and document the ethnic backgrounds of all groups of farm workers. The City should ascertain the special housing needs of the various Asian and Pacific island workers and the farmworker populations from each Meso-American and South American region. The City should also aim to understand and respect cultural differences within each population for example there are cultural differences between Guatemalans, Salvadorans, Mexicans, etc. and comprehend that within those cultures there are Indigenous ethnic differences. Should the City wish to address housing meaningfully, the City should include a discussion of all the populations that work on farms within the City.

The tragic January 2023 shootings took place at Concord Farms and Terra Garden farms situated in the County of San Mateo. The statement included on page D- 21 describing the farmworker community living on the farm leads the reader to assume that those workers lived within the jurisdiction of the City of Half Moon Bay when it appears, Concord Farms and Terra Garden where those workers lived are in the jurisdiction of the County of San Mateo. The statement about the shooting is not beneficial in supporting Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) or contributing to the justification demonstrating integration and segregation. It is, instead, an insensitive statement that can be viewed as an exploitation of the victims and their families to further the City's approval of its Housing Element. All references to the January 2023 shooting should be stricken from the Housing Element.

From: James Benjamin
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2024 4:24 PM
To: Housing Element
Subject: Fwd: Please extend comment time before considering adoption of HCD revisions

redux!

From: James Benjamin
Date: May 31, 2024 at 4:38:24 PM MDT
To: housingelement **Cc:** [hrarback](#)
Subject: Please extend comment time before considering adoption of HCD revisions

Dear Jill:

While on a car trip out of state, I learned of the noticed hearing for the Council consideration of the revisions proposed by HCD to the Housing Element of the General Plan. I have heard from several alarmed citizens who feel they have not had adequate time to consider these changes, particularly in light of the way the policies of the LCLUP were treated in the 555 Kelly project. Both of our names on the the front page of that document, I cannot grasp how a policy clearly limiting workforce housing at maximum of 10 units at the Adcock center has been interpreted to allow 40 units at a LLA-adjusted site. I would like to understand it better, and what its implications are for the relaxing of other LCP housing restrictions — and how these concerns dovetail with the housing element revision. I hope you will appreciate my desire to more clearly understand how the revisions, which I have not analyzed, will be consistent with the LCLUP.

Thank you for mentioning storm drainage and geologic hazards in this draft document. As you know from public comments at planning commission meeting concerning watercourse-related hazards, and code enforcement complaints, it is clear that our hydrologic resources have been poorly understood for much of Half Moon Bay's development, and poorly thought out development, in some cases unpermitted, poses significant hazards to coastal resources and development, including Pilarcitos Park, SAM and my home. As I noted from the dais in consideration of the City Corp yard near Pilarcitos Creek, locating development, particularly affordable housing, adjacent to Pilarcitos Creek in an area of high geologic hazard seems like a poor choice by our council (I understand that you are following their guidance). I look forward to addressing this concern again with the regular coastal development permit for that project replaces the emergency CDP that was issued — as required by the LCLUP that we worked so hard to complete.

You know that I would only be too happy to discuss these concerns with you and with your colleagues. For that reason, I hope that the hearing on this revision will be extended to allow ideas to be illuminated as carefully thought through for the long term, or revised to achieve that goal. While additional public review may not satisfy all concerns raised by citizens, it would go a long way to undoing the frustration they feel when the review period occurs over a national holiday.

Thank you for considering my comments, and knowing the collaborative spirit in which I offer them.

Sincerely,

James Benjamin
Half Moon Bay, California

From: Mike Ferreira

Sent: Friday, May 31, 2024 4:29 PM

To: Housing Element

Subject: Half Moon Bay Housing Element - Measure D Proposed Changes

To: Whom it may concern,

First, I do not understand how material changes can be made to Half Moon Bay's Housing Element without formal review by the Half Moon Bay Planning Commission or by the Half Moon Bay City Council. Planning staff are not legislators and a brief 7 day public comment period is not a substitute for a public hearing.

Second, the choices of words in the changes (underlined) to Program 6-8 are not well chosen and pose the potential of being seriously misread as to City policy and misapplied by either HCD or City planning staff. In particular:

<<One area of focus will be to eliminate or reduce the number of allocations required for ADUs and JADUs.>>

This could, and likely would, be read to mean that a City policy goal is to eliminate ADU and JADU Measure D constraints. Measure D was passed by a substantial percentage of Half Moon Bay voters and it is their decision to amend Measure D and not the decision of the HCD or HMB planning staff to revise at will.

The same is true for the following, also in Program 6-8:

<<If Needed: Prepare Code amendments to update the Measure D allocation process to reduce constraints on <RHNA> housing production. The need for a Code amendment is indicated if there are not enough allocations for ADUs, mobile/manufactured homes, and/or multi-family units including duplexes and larger projects.>>

Clearly, this list above goes well against the will of the voters and of the City Council by expressing an unjustifiable "need" given that Measure D is capable of performing to our RHNA, as stated earlier. The City Council needs to give careful review to what amounts to serious interference with its duties and responsibilities.

Regards,

Mike Ferreira

From: Marty Nash
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2024 4:55 PM
To: Housing Element
Subject: Cycle 6 Notes

Dear Ms. Ekas and Half Moon Bay City Council Members,

Thank you for your thorough and thoughtful work in preparing the Housing Element Plan and recent revisions. I wholeheartedly support the movement toward providing more housing for those in need, and I think the drafted plan is a very good one.

The purpose of this email is to comment on plans noted on page C-40 and C-41 regarding the property at 940 Main Street. My family is currently renting and living in the house located on the property. We have lived in The Metzgar House, as some in town call it, for almost five years and love the house, neighborhood, and city.

In a revision noted in the Site Description section on page C-40, the plan states, "The Eastern portion containing the historic home will be parceled off." Our hope is that consideration will be given to preserving the Coastal Redwood that is located on this Eastern portion, just to the south of the house. The tree is not immediately recognizable as a Redwood, as at some point in its life, the top was cut off or stunted in some way. As a result, the tree grows outward rather than up, with branches fuller than those you'd find in a forest. When you walk under these branches, you find a beautiful canopy and trunk measuring over eleven feet in circumference. This is a very old tree, and we hope it will be saved.

My second comment does not pertain to a specific revision, but to a section of the plan located in the Owner/Developer Interest section on page C-41. Here it states, "City staff have discussed adaptive reuse of the home [at 940 Main St.] with prospective developers for childcare, supportive services, or a community space." We support providing these types of services, but we do hope that if this were to happen, relocation considerations would be part of this planning, as we would be forced to relocate. As a family of educators and one of the few African-American families in Half Moon Bay, we feel an eviction with no reasonable plans for relocation would run counter to the spirit of the Housing Element Plan. As stated in the plan, finding affordable rental housing for a family of four is not easy, so we appreciate your thoughtful consideration of our situation. I am somewhat hesitant to say any of this, as I know an easy way around what I have brought up here would be to ask the current owners to evict us before a sale to the city takes place, but I am also confident the planners will show us the same thoughtful, compassionate considerations shown throughout the planning document.

Thank you for your time and your excellent work.

Sincerely,
Martin Nash

From: Velma Atkinson
Sent: Friday, June 7, 2024 2:09 PM
To: Housing Element
Subject: Site 3 - 300 Block of Church Street

To Mike Noce and Matthew Chidester:

Re: City of Half Moon Bay Housing Element – HCD Draft May 31, 2023
Technical Report Appendix C – Housing Resources
Pages C-29 through 31, Site 3. 300 block Church Street

The site where Our Lady of the Pillar Catholic Church resides, as well as the adjacent vacant land are all owned by the Archdiocese of San Francisco. The City of Half Moon Bay has expressed interest in using this land for low to very-low-income housing since 2021. We have replied (see attached), as has the Archdiocese, that we are not interested in providing the land, through sale, or long-term lease for use by the city. While the Archdiocese is the legal owner of the property, they defer to the Parish Pastor to bind the church and the Archdiocese into agreements using church property under their jurisdiction.

Your statement for Site 3 on pages C-29 through C-31 of the revised Housing Element gives the impression by stating “numerous church parishioners have also expressed interest in the owner partnering with a non-profit housing developer to build on this mostly unused property” that would somehow lend credibility to a binding agreement being put forth. Parishioners are given the opportunity to provide feedback on any planned improvements to church property, but the ultimate authority and agreement resides with the Parish Pastor. The Archdiocese will not go against the local Pastor’s wishes.

The vacant property is used for Church fundraisers to supplement our operating budget. It is not appropriate for the city to characterize or minimize the significance of its use to the Church. The picture of the land in question included on page C-31 also includes valuable parking space that is utilized every day. We recently had to contest our inclusion in the 555 Kelly project that this parking site can be made available for residents of that property. We made clear this property is neither under-utilized nor is there any extra parking space for public use. The city continues to mischaracterize these issues to serve its own purpose but is disrespecting and discounting the educational needs of our youth and our Church.

We have long-term internal plans for the use of that property and are in the planning process of building a Christian K-8 Academy, as well as classrooms for our Religious Education courses that prepare students to take the sacraments of First Holy Communion and Confirmation. We retain the right to use the land as an investment for the future of the parish and its parishioners.

We are asking you to please remove Our Lady of the Pillar Catholic Church as Site 3. for consideration for potential use of affordable residential development on this property.

In Christ Blessings,
Fr. Jose Corral
Pastor
Our Lady of the Pillar Catholic Church
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019



Our Lady of the Pillar Church
400 Church Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
(650) 726-4674 Fax (650) 726-0980

February 5, 2021

Joaquin Jimenez
Half Moon Bay City Hall
501 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Dear Joaquin:

We are aware of the interest in providing affordable housing here on the coast due to the lack of available housing in the Bay Area. We have also been made aware of several parties interested in the piece of land on the north end of our property on Church Street at Our Lady of the Pillar.

Over the years, the land has been considered for a K-8 school, a temporary site to house the homeless, or for creating religious education classrooms for the youth of our Parish. In the interim years it has been utilized for fundraising opportunities to supplement our operating budget. For example, we sell parking spaces during the Pumpkin Festival, host drive-in movies, hold religious retreats and Charismatic Congresses. It is a fairly substantial source of income we are fortunate to have available for our use.

At this time, navigating the state and county COVID restrictions has been challenging for us as it has been for everyone. Our fundraising activities are limited and our ability to maintain weekly collections has been unsteady. We have spent much time budget forecasting, which includes incorporating any capital projects we may be able to undertake in the near future, all with the uncertainty of when we will be able to resume regular services inside our facilities.

With all that in mind, in order for us to better serve the Hispanic, Portuguese and Italian communities that rely on our Parish to preserve the Catholic traditions in our community, it is our obligation to reserve the space for establishing a Catholic Pre-K school, with more classrooms to house our Religious Education programs. We feel that reserving the land to talk about Jesus Christ fulfills the spiritual capital, social capital and intellectual capital important for the wider community.

In summary, a meeting is not necessary since we are not interested in providing the space for any other use. Thank you for your interest.

In Christs Blessings,

Rev. Father Jose Corral
Pastor
Our Lady of the Pillar Parish